

Martin	Randolph	Thurmond
Morse	Robertson	Wiley
Moss	Smith	Williams, Del.
Mundt	Sparkman	Yarborough
Neuberger	Stennis	Young, Ohio
Prouty	Symington	
Proxmire	Talmadge	

NAYS—2

Morton Scott

NOT VOTING—43

Beall	Capehart	Dirksen
Bennett	Carlson	Dodd
Bridges	Chavez	Eastland
Bush	Clark	Fong
Byrd, Va.	Cotton	Fulbright

Goldwater	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Gore	Keating	Pastore
Gruening	Kefauver	Russell
Hartke	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Hayden	Kerr	Schoepfel
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Smathers
Hill	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Hruska	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Humphrey	Murray	
Javits	Muskie	

So the motion to recess was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Saturday, August 29, 1959, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 28 (legislative day of August 26), 1959:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

James Smith Bush, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Algernon L. Butler, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of North Carolina.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel, of California, at Ceremony Commemorating the Death of Padre Junipero Serra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] at the ceremony in Statuary Hall, on August 28, commemorating the death of Padre Junipero Serra.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL AT THE CEREMONY IN STATUARY HALL COMMEMORATING THE DEATH OF PADRE JUNIPERO SERRA, FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 1959

These services commemorate the life and labors of a Franciscan friar whose intrepid Christian ministrations were spread throughout a great primitive area before the United States came into being. Junipero Serra, Franciscan missionary from Majorca journeyed to the North American continent in 1750, and in the last 1760's went northward to California.

In that northward trek, both he and his courageous, faithful companions sowed in the hearts and minds of men, the seeds of a new civilization under divine spirit. Father Serra brought with him the mission, which meant the spread of religion in these unknown lands; the presidio, which meant the expansion of the political and military control of Spain; and the pueblo, the town, which meant the establishment of orderly civil government. Here was a tripartite development, both secular and spiritual. The hard trails that his weary feet traversed from mission to mission along the El Camino Real continue today to be the royal road along which are strung great cities, great universities, great industries, and great agriculture—human progress in its every latest attainment.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago Father Serra departed this life. From a primitive unsettled land on the Pacific shore to which he came has developed a majestic center of cultural and economic life, rich in all the bounty of nature, our magnificent State of California.

While we honor Junipero Serra for the blessings of civilization he left in California, we shall not forget that his was a spiritual

labor. The missions he built, the agriculture he founded—supported, incidentally, by irrigation systems which excite the admiration of the modern hydraulic engineer—were all means to an end. The sword was there to support the cross and so was the civil authority. But it was the cross which came first. Imbued with divine spirit, charged with an exalted mission, and sustained by an unflinching faith, Father Serra brought to the Indians the civilizing message of Christian teachings. Here was the solid foundation upon which all other building rested. It is well to recall this simple fact in our own day. For we, too, have an exalted mission: To hold high the banner of man's freedom, to protect it from all assaults from the ungodly, and to advance it, by an unflinching faith in the righteousness of our purpose.

The 1960 Republican Presidential
NominationEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate two articles which have appeared recently about Vice President NIXON. One is a long and very thoughtful analysis by Alan L. Otten about the situation with respect to the 1960 Republican presidential nomination. The other article is an interview in the Christian Science Monitor.

I ask unanimous consent to have these two articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 27, 1959]

NOT 1952—THE TAFT-NIXON, IKE-ROCKEFELLER PARALLELS ARE MUCH LESS VALID THAN OFTEN CLAIMED

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—After looking long, but not too hard, at the jockeying for the 1960 GOP presidential nomination, some soothsayers are falling back on what is becoming a common political aphorism: "It will be 1952 all over again."

But this theory, while neat in its way, will not stand up under close examination.

Behind the assumption lies the belief that, regardless of the outcome, political events are casting Vice President NIXON in the role of

the late Senator Taft, and New York's Governor Rockefeller in the role of General Eisenhower. Those who expect 1960 to be a repetition of 1952 state their case thusly: Mr. Taft, while commanding the loyalty of much of the GOP, also had the enmity of many party leaders, led by then Governor Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, who apparently now is masterminding the Rockefeller candidacy. The anti-Taft Republicans hitched their hopes to a bright new star with a nonpolitical aura, and put Mr. Eisenhower across by beating hard on the theme "Taft can't win."

Certainly there are strong similarities between the Taft-Eisenhower struggle and the Nixon-Rockefeller battle that's shaping up. Certainly the Rockefeller backers are getting set to try to torpedo the Vice President's White House ambitions with the same sort of "can't win" theme song they effectively used against the Ohio Senator. The differences, however, are equally striking, even if less well understood.

To begin with, Mr. Taft's opposition within the Republican Party was far more extensive than is the party opposition to Mr. Nixon. Or perhaps more accurately, the Vice President's following among GOP regulars is probably greater than that enjoyed by any other Republican, including Mr. Taft, in recent history. It is true, to be sure, that much of the Vice President's support lacks the fervor that characterized the Taft backers of the early 1950's.

In 1951 and 1952, some Republicans looked upon Senator Taft as an old warhorse, respected and even revered, but suspected as a candidate as being too conservative on domestic economic policies, somewhat arbitrary and a little condescending in dealing with people he did not consider his intellectual equals. Moreover, there were those who sincerely questioned Mr. Taft's views on foreign policy as being "too isolationist" and his qualifications to deal with the overriding issues between the United States and Russia.

MATTER OF BACKGROUND

By contrast, Mr. Rockefeller patently lacks the background and experience on which was built another 1952 Eisenhower slogan, "He knows how to deal with the Russians." Mr. Nixon, to be sure, also lacks the Eisenhower reputation as a war hero and standing as a military-diplomatic statesman in world councils. But the Nixon supporters can and do claim his years as understudy to Mr. Eisenhower and the late Secretary of State Dulles have given him a background that no other Republican today can enjoy. Certainly no one has ever seriously questioned the Vice President's internationalist tendencies, which have been evident at least since his years as a freshman Congressman.

To many people in 1952 Senator Taft was identified with what's commonly called the Old Guard wing of his party, even though politically he was more liberal on some issues—housing and health legislation, for example—than Mr. Eisenhower. Here again

by contrast, Mr. Nixon is part of and identified with a very popular President and Republican administration that has widespread support not only among Republican voters but, as well, among Democrats and independents.

Nowhere can the contrasts be more drawn, however, than in the political alignments of 1952 and 1959-60. For one thing, nearly all the former Taft backers are now firmly in the Nixon camp. But so, too, are many groups and individuals who once supported Eisenhower.

Lined up with Mr. Nixon also is much of the former citizens-for-Eisenhower group including its cochairman, former Under Secretary of Commerce Walter Williams. These once-Eisenhower, now Nixon rooters also include such liberal Senators as HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky, as well as large numbers of GOP House Members. It is also an interesting fact that the Vice President's three principal staff political aides were either actively for or sympathetic with the Eisenhower candidacy of 7 years ago. These are Mr. Nixon's top assistant, Robert H. Finch; his press secretary, Herbert H. Klein; and Charles K. McWhorter, a special assistant, who was secretary of the National Youth for Eisenhower in 1952.

Moreover, the bulk of Mr. Eisenhower's professional GOP support came from the Nation's 25 Republican Governors. Though there are now only 15 GOP Governors, most of them are lined up solidly with Mr. Nixon. The Vice President's widespread backing among lawmakers in Congress and the Republican Governors illustrates a fact that still is not fully appreciated.

Contrary to widespread impressions, the political "ins" supported Mr. Eisenhower in 1952, while much of the Taft support came from the "outs" who were trying to get "in." There were many exceptions, to be sure, to that generality. But with fewer exceptions now, the "ins" are backing the Vice President, while the "outs" are lining up with the New York Governor in hopes of getting "in." Most any professional politician would tell you that this, indeed, is not the strongest political position.

Moreover, it would be difficult to estimate the number of Republicans throughout the country who are deep in Mr. Nixon's debt. He has spoken and campaigned for Republican candidates in nearly every State over the last 7 years. He has done favors in Washington for hundreds of GOP officials. While Senator Taft was primarily the philosophical leader of his party, functioning mainly through the Senate and only occasionally with grassroots contacts outside Ohio, Mr. Nixon has contacts and debtors everywhere.

And while Mr. Nixon seems to have a kind of party support that Mr. Taft never knew, Mr. Rockefeller would appear to have considerably less backing than did General Eisenhower. Whereas Mr. Rockefeller is largely unknown beyond the borders of his State, every American was familiar with the beaming smile of the World War II commander.

QUESTION OF THE POLLS

The public opinion polls, which were used with such devastating effect against Senator Taft before the 1952 convention, do not thus far seem likely to provide Mr. Rockefeller with similar ammunition. Mr. Nixon has been doing much better in the polls than did the late Senator, both with regular Republicans and independents. And while Mr. Eisenhower started pulling away in the polls once he entered the race, the New York Governor actually slumped after his big post-election showing. Mr. Nixon would have to slump very hard indeed for the opinion polls to give the Rockefeller camp much support for a "Nixon can't win" campaign.

The Vice President, too, is in many ways a more astute political performer than was the Ohio Senator. Mr. Taft had a brilliant mind, but comparatively little finesse with people—and it was a rare moment that he stirred an audience. His speaking style was dry and pedantic.

Mr. Nixon, on the other hand, is almost flawless mechanically: There is much of the actor in him, not that he is insincere, but rather that he has cultivated a dynamic stage presence. He is at ease, he is sure, he is dramatic, and his most recent doings in the international spotlight would seem to attest to these qualities.

The Vice President's press relations are good. He works assiduously at keeping newsmen informed and is deliberately patient under pertinent questioning. Mr. Taft's relations with the press, however, were spotty and unsatisfactory.

Mr. Nixon rarely runs away from hot issues but usually handles touchy subjects with a diplomacy the late Senator could not match. It is difficult, for instance, to imagine the Vice President doing what Mr. Taft did during the 1952 South Dakota primary when he was asked his views on the price of gold. This was a vital subject in the gold-mining area of the State, but Mr. Taft stoutly proclaimed the current price too high. Later, an aid remonstrated with him, thought he had persuaded the Senator he had spoken too harshly, and arranged for the question to be put to the Senator again the following day. "I answered that last night," Mr. Taft snapped. "The price is too high."

In 1952, it must also be remembered, other candidates were in the wings—Governor Warren of California, perennial hopeful Harold Stassen, favorite sons—who helped deadlock the convention and permit the Eisenhower maneuvering. By all present indications, if Mr. Rockefeller challenges in 1960—and there seems little doubt that he will—it will be a two-man race, with no room to use favorite sons and stalking horses to halt the big first-ballot Nixon strength.

ART OF COMMAND

On the other side, there are several areas in which Mr. Rockefeller does not come up to the 1952 Eisenhower as a candidate. The New York Governor's newness on the political scene is not counterweighted, as it was in the general case, with a long period as a popular leader. His brief tenure in Albany has not provided Mr. Rockefeller with the time to demonstrate his ability fully. His move to raise State taxes immediately after taking office did him little good, politically, as he himself admitted. And while it indicated his willingness to command, the uproar the tax boost caused gave evidence the measure did not have wide understanding or support. The art of command is not quite the same as the art of leadership.

It should not be overlooked, also, that the Rockefeller name in many sections of the country does not arouse friendly feelings. The 1952 Eisenhower was a self-made man up from the Kansas cornfields. Governor Rockefeller has a less bucolic background.

After all the evidence is in, a man would have to be downright imprudent to guess who will carry the GOP standard next year. But that same evidence makes very clear how inaccurate is the aphorism: "It will be 1952 all over again."

It won't be. It will be 1960, for the reason that Nixon is not Taft and Rockefeller is not Eisenhower.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 26, 1959]

ELEVATING THE VICE PRESIDENT—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HUGH SCOTT

(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, a veteran of eight

terms in the House, national chairman of the Republican Party 1948-49, an early (1949) supporter of an Eisenhower candidacy in 1952, and today a supporter of Vice President Nixon for the GOP presidential nomination:

Sees no substantial difference between Vice President Nixon and Governor Rockefeller on foreign policy, but regards Mr. Nixon as the best qualified candidate in either party in the foreign-affairs field.

Anticipates Mr. Rockefeller would become the GOP presidential candidate and leader of his party after he has served another term as Governor and after a Nixon administration nationally.

Question: "Senator Scott, why do you feel Vice President Nixon is the best qualified man for the Republican nomination for the Presidency?"

Answer: "Well, I would say on the basis of experience and temperament, personality. Undoubtedly he is the best qualified candidate in either party in the foreign affairs field, one who has been singularly blessed with the opportunity to meet chiefs of state and of government. His experience and wisdom in handling difficult problems have been demonstrated by the Moscow trip, the Latin-American trip, by the way he conducted himself at the time of the two serious illnesses of the President, and by the degree to which his advice is valued by people experienced themselves in government; for example, in the National Security Council."

Question: "How do you feel Mr. Nixon compares as a votegetter with Mr. Rockefeller?"

Answer: "I think both have demonstrated they are excellent votegetters. They are both attractive personalities who grow in attraction as you have the chance to know more about them. A half hour before this interview I was talking with Governor Rockefeller. He is a most attractive man. I think if he is reelected Governor of New York—and I expect he would be—he would become the next candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency, and I expect, too, that he would probably become the party's leader for a decade or more."

"There is a great place in the sun for Governor Rockefeller and I admire him without reserve. But the situation presently indicates that Republicans would be well advised to close ranks, as there is every indication they are doing, and really go to work along with independents and Democrats to elect a competent, experienced and wise and moderate man in Dick Nixon as their next President."

Question: "Then you don't feel Governor Rockefeller will formally become a candidate for the nomination?"

Answer: "It is my judgment that he probably will not in any real all-out down-the-line campaign. I think surveys among Republican leaders indicate that Vice President Nixon will be nominated on the first ballot, perhaps by acclamation. I hope that when they come around to talking about vice presidential candidates they will give very serious thought to Governor Rockefeller. I think it would be a dream ticket."

Question: "Since you were one of the original Eisenhower supporters, do you have indications from other early Eisenhower men as to their preference now?"

Answer: "Well, I have talked to many early supporters of President Eisenhower and to many Democrats-for-Eisenhower and the greater part of them favor Vice President Nixon as the Republican candidate. There are some who favor Governor Rockefeller and I think rather notably in one or two of the Southern States."

Question: "Would you say there is any substantial difference between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Rockefeller on international policy?"

Answer: "I can't see where such an area of difference would arise. Governor Rockefeller has some edge in South America by virtue of his experience in those countries, but the policy down there would be the same in either event, a good-neighbor policy of nonintervention and of friendly and benevolent cooperation. In the rest of the world, Nixon's experience counts more heavily. The policy of both of these gentlemen is the policy of Dwight Eisenhower."

Question: "What about domestic policy?"

Answer: "In domestic policy I would be inclined to say that the Nixon policy would be, in the future as in the past, adherence to the general Eisenhower program, a moderate, middle-of-the-road policy. Vice President Nixon has shown his convictions on the tough issues, such as civil rights, and in my judgment he has been right and proper in

his attitude there. He has, if anything, shown an inclination to go a little beyond the Eisenhower program in some areas, such as housing.

"I think that Governor Rockefeller's record indicates he is perhaps somewhat more on the liberal side in meeting the necessities which the Governor of New York has to meet in the political world, but he is no wild-eyed radical by any means."

Question: "If there is a fight between the two for the nomination do you feel there will be any outstanding issues, or will it be over who is the best leader, over personality questions?"

Answer: "There are some differences on issues, but none that occur to me as the kind which appear in presidential campaigns. If it came to a choice between the two, it would be based on personality, experience, and ability to handle the job."

Question: "Any particular reason why you have made known your preference so early?"

Answer: "The main reason is that I don't want anything. I am sure that when I campaigned so vigorously for General Eisenhower there were many people in the entourage who may have harbored doubts on that score and wondered why I worked so hard and my wife worked so hard. I just wanted to keep on being a Member of the House of Representatives. The same thing is true now."

"I am extremely happy; in fact, I am in something of a glow about being a Senator of the United States. It is something I have wanted since I was 13 years old. Why should I want anything else? Not having anything in my mind except the desire to get the strongest candidate for the Republican Party and the best qualified man for the Presidency of the United States, I can afford to come out early."

SENATE

SATURDAY, AUGUST 29, 1959

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 26, 1959)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Lawrence D. Folkemer, pastor, Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

In faith, we lift our hearts unto Thee, O God, beseeching Thee for a mountainous faith to remove obstacles of prejudice, pride, and pettiness.

With courage, we call upon Thee for still greater courage to stand for the right course when the lesser course seems safer.

In hope, we look to Thee as our continuing refuge and strength, our peace and our deliverance.

Grant, O Lord, that we may never become too big or vain to pray; then cleanse our prayers of mere politeness and presumption. Help us to do Thy will, rather than to seek divine support for our own bidding.

In these misty days of uncertainty and confusion, wilt Thou guide the conversations and plans of our President and Congress, that America may continue as a lighthouse of freedom, godliness, and peace. Unite us, sustain us; and, above all, use us as Thou wilt. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 28, 1959, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 85-880—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8374) to amend Public Law 85-880, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8374) to amend Public Law 85-880, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the first sentence of section 1 of the Act of September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-880; 72 Stat. 1603) is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) After the phrase, 'World Science—Pan Pacific Exposition', insert 'now known as Century 21 Exposition'.

"(b) Strike out '1961' and insert in lieu thereof '1961 and 1962'."

"Sec. 2. That part of clause (3) of section 3 of said Act before the proviso is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) erect such buildings and other structures as may be appropriate for the United States participation in the exposition on land (six and one-half acres or more and including land necessary for ingress and egress) conveyed to the United States in fee simple and free and clear of liens and encumbrances, in consideration of the participation by the United States in the exposition, and without other consideration. In the design and construction of such buildings and other structures consideration, including consultation with the General Services Administration, shall be given to their utility for governmental purposes and needs after the close of the exposition."

"Sec. 3. Clause (5) of section 3 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(5) incur such other expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including but not limited to expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other ac-

quisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor and the actual display thereof, and including but not limited to related expenditures for costs of transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, maintenance and operation, rental of space and dismantling."

"Sec. 4. Section 3 of said Act is further amended by striking out the period at the end of clause (6) and inserting a semicolon and the word 'and', and by adding at the end of such section a new clause (7) as follows:

"(7) procure services as authorized by the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem."

"Sec. 5. Said Act is amended by striking out section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof new sections 7 and 8 as follows:

"Sec. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, not to exceed \$12,500,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act, including participation in the exposition.

"Sec. 8. The functions authorized in this Act may be performed without regard to the prohibitions and limitations of the following laws: section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529); section 3735, Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 13)'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

OVERTON BROOKS,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JAMES G. FULTON,
GORDON L. McDONOUGH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

HOOR OF MEETING ON MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it take a recess until Monday morning, at 11 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I object. The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legisla-